

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,
AND
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

OCTOBER, 1833.

ART. I. *Strictures on an Article entitled "Church and State."*

A WRITER in the Monitor, on the subject of marriage, over the signature of J. A., has taken my attention for some time past; so as that I designed to send you a few strictures on the arguments contained in the first paper written by him on the subject, until another writer appeared on the other side, who satisfied me, in the main, as the views of this writer corresponded with my own, in so far as my mind is at present engaged. J. A., in a late paper, complains of this writer, that he refers to no former article as the object of attack; doubtless supposing, that he might have had a reference to the paper written by said J. A. But I must say, for this writer, that he is to be excused; as, from the rambling manner in which J. A. conducts his reasoning on controversial subjects, it is no easy matter to reply to him in a direct way, and keep within limits in such a reply, which would make it suitable for insertion in a periodical, and at the same time do justice to the subject. It would require a volume: as you have not a connected chain of reasoning before you, by which you can get hold of him in particular points of controversy: but you have to take incidental observations, and give them, each one, by themselves, which is a tedious, and, in a great measure, an unprofitable way of managing controversy. Doubtless the writer of *Reasons for the Previous Publication of Marriage* saw this, and wisely adopted the mode he used. And for this very reason, with others, as I have concluded to say something on the subject, I am here to take a mode of my own.

I have said, that his reasoning upon the subject he treats of is very loose, and I am to show that this is undeniably the case. After a lengthy introduction, he launches out on his subject, by assuming three fundamental principles, which he takes for granted until the contrary be proved, upon which he builds his whole argument in the sequel of his first paper, and, of course, also in his second paper: which fundamental principles are, "1. That marriage is an institution purely civil. 2. In an organized state of the community it is the proper function of some officer of the peace, and is competent only to those who are authorized by the state, to administer the ordinance and oath of marriage. 3. The rule for the publication of banns, both matter and form of it, is a rule of mere human enactment, and derives its precedence over other rules in respect of authority; that is, it derives its whole authority from the power devising and enacting it." And, as a specimen of the manner of his reasoning, I

shall refer you to his paper in reply to the aforesaid writer, in his review of prop. 7, where he reasons as follows: "Prop. 7 is, in substance, that magistrates should be censured for celebrating a marriage without previous publication. It professes to be built upon the foregoing propositions, particularly this principle, 'that persons thus marrying, neglect God's mind and will, and violate his ordinance on this head.' It professes to be built upon the divine ordinance of publication. If so, the proposition has been shewn to be without foundation, and I might here close the disputation." The phrase "divine ordinance," I am not to defend or find fault with. But mark, reader, his conclusion: "It professes to be built upon the divine ordinance of publication. If so, the proposition has been shewn to be without foundation." Where was this shewn? Why, in his 3d fundamental principle *taken for granted*, namely, that "The rule for the publication of banns, both matter and form of it, is a rule of mere human enactment." He might prove any thing in this way, if he will get persons satisfied with such a mode of reasoning. I might prove easily in the same way, that the paper entitled *Church and State*, and the paper written by the other writer, are written by the same person. If it is asked, how? I might set out by saying, that I take the matter for granted, and then go on to say, "they spell some words in the same way; they treat on the same subject, and then affirm, that it is needless to say any more, for I have proven it sufficiently already. How? Why, I assumed it as a fundamental principle, when I commenced, that I will take the thing for granted." And thus he has been playing upon the good nature of your readers for months together, by long-winded arguments founded upon a thing taken for granted! And the foundation being such, the whole superstructure which is reared upon it is but as the "baseless fabric of a vision." Thus, too, your readers are left, before they can decide for themselves upon the subject he has so long treated upon, to go back to these assumed fundamental principles, and try whether they are principles which are really founded in truth, or not. And thus their time is wasted to no good purpose whatever: or if they have fallen in with him in the opinion he has formed on the subject, they but like himself, take the whole for granted. He should have shewn, for instance, upon good grounds, that marriage is really an institution purely civil, and also explained what he meant by it as an institution purely civil, or wherein it is so, as much of the controversy depends on the sense in which this expression is taken, if it is a warrantable one, when used in relation to marriage. He should have also established the truth of his 2d and 3d fundamental principles, in doing which, he had shewn that he designed not to take any advantage. And, in fact, the half of the work had been done: or rather, the thing he intended to prove, been established, and no more was necessary. For if he makes good his three fundamental principles, which he assumes for granted, few will differ from him on the point he intends to prove. I, for one, will not. A wise builder will endeavor to lay the foundation answerable to the superstructure he is to rear upon it. And as proof, was that which he designed to furnish his readers with, on the point he takes in hand to establish, it surely was the way most calculated to convince, to set out in the commencement of his argument with laying down well established principles; in doing which, if he had kept to his point, he would have carried conviction along with him, as he went on in the subsequent discussion of his subject. But he has not done so, and therefore his reasoning in the pages of the *Monitor*, on the subject of the previous publication of banns, will have little weight with candid enquirers after truth. It has a further defect, which is, that he often takes things for granted, in the course of his reasoning throughout. And a still further defect, that to

me he is often incomprehensible; perhaps, in part, for the reasons mentioned. And to bring the matter to a point, I would submit to him the following questions, taken chiefly from his own papers, which treat on this subject; an answer to which, as brief as possible, in the affirmative or negative, where this will suffice, and a little more largely where explanation is necessary, will tend much to bring the subject fairly before the public mind, and enable candid enquirers after truth to judge for themselves. In matters of truth and duty, to know what is right is always of great importance; and unanimity of views upon this subject is an object much to be desired, as it might tend greatly to bring about that harmony which contrary views, if not a contrary practice, in respect to it has hitherto more or less interrupted. The questions I propose, are as follows.

1. J. A. asserts, that marriage is an institution or ordinance purely civil. How does marriage become a purely civil ordinance, when the Church has an equal interest in the matter with the State, and interests peculiar to herself in the case of those who are church members? It is through marriage the Church as well as the State continue to exist; and the church covenant embraces parents with children, just as the State takes in children with parents as its members. And it belongs to her as she is engaged in a public witnessing for God, to tell others around her what are their duties, and to see that none of her members, in any capacity whatever, give countenance to them in walking contrary thereto. And in what sense is it a civil ordinance different from that in which it is a religious ordinance, or a church ordinance? Is it a civil ordinance in that sense in which the State has a right to enjoin marriage upon her members? (which, I presume, J. A. will not assert.) In this sense, the Church will not claim it to be a religious ordinance; or in the same sense as some of her ordinances are, which are confessedly religious ordinances, and which she has a right to enjoin upon her members the observance of. Or is it a civil ordinance in that sense that the civil State has a right to make laws respecting it, and take order how her members enter into it, who choose to marry? Then what gives this right to the State, to make laws respecting it, which does not give the same right to the Church, in regard to those who are her members? J. A. affirms, that marriage is an ordinance purely civil; many deny this; and when sides are taken upon a subject, it belongs to him who affirms to show why, and not to him who takes the negative side. The last has but to say, "I want proof."

2d. He admits, that both Church and State are included in the general title of father and mother, in the Fifth Commandment; and yet seems to deny the Church the same right to make laws for her members which he allows to the State. If the Church and State are alike father and mother over their respective members, how is it that, in the case of marriage, the State has a right to make her laws and see them enforced, and the Church cannot make regulations that can or ought to operate at all, when the State interferes, or even when the State does not hinder, as in the case of previous publication?

3d. He seems to deny the Church to have any right to interfere with the conduct of persons as members of State, and particularly with Church members, who are also civil officers in the execution of their civil authority. Has the Church no oversight whatever over her members, in things which are of a civil nature, say marriage; (supposing it to be as J. A. asserts it to be an institution purely civil;) paying of taxes; a magistrate's exercise of his office, whether he discharges it faithfully or not?—whether he sees to the just execution of the laws of the State or not?—or violates just and useful regulations of the Church? How, being a

member of the Church, does he become so privileged as a civil officer, if a privilege it is, that she has no oversight over him in these things: and cannot, if he violates a special rule of the Church, call him to an account?

4th. Those many precepts, exhortations and directions concerning marriage in itself, and the duties of married persons, contained in the Scriptures;—are they to be considered as simple advices, such as I may give to a neighbor, given by the several penmen in their private capacity? or are they to be considered as the Spirit of God, through them, laying before Church members and others to whom the word of God comes, their duty in such cases? And has the Church no right to see that her members walk conformably to them in their own case? and also that they do not assist and give countenance to others in the violation of them? or, is all that is said in our Bibles about marriage, as the account which is given of its original institution, with the laws respecting it, and duties of married persons, given there only for the use of the State; or also, and mainly, for the benefit of the Church? And if for the Church, is it only that private church members may know how to conduct themselves in the case? Or also, that Church courts may see it to be their duty to take cognizance of her members in the affair of marriage?

5th. If marriage is a purely civil ordinance, then how does it become the business of ministers of the Gospel at all to perform the ceremony? And if it belongs to persons only to solemnize this ordinance who are authorised by the State, have legislative bodies a right, if this is the case, to authorize ministers to do it, making them to be standing public officers of the State, and in virtue of their office too, especially under a republican constitution, which requires that its civil officers be put in by the people, who have the best and only right to choose their own public officers?

6. J. A. divides the solemnization of marriage, when the minister of the Gospel officiates, into two parts: that which is purely ecclesiastical, and that which is purely civil; referring the civil part to the civil officer as such, whether magistrate or minister acting as a civil officer in administering the oath of marriage: and the ecclesiastical to the gospel minister, in his ministerial benediction or prayer, with the word of instruction and exhortation accompanying it. But how can there be an ecclesiastical solemnization of a purely civil ordinance? If a gospel minister does not perform the whole ceremony, by virtue of his office as a minister of the Gospel, what call has he in all cases to perform that part of it which is ecclesiastical, as well as that part of it which is called civil, when he performs the ceremony of marriage? May not the civil magistrate, who officiates, pray for the Divine blessing on the married pair, equally with a minister of the Gospel? And why connect the word of exhortation with the civil institution of marriage, supposing it to be an institution purely civil, more than with any other civil institution whatever? How can there be an ecclesiastical solemnization of a thing about which the Church has no concern, and over which she has no authority, and that does not in any sense come under her jurisdiction?

7. He allows, that the Church may prohibit her ministers from solemnizing marriage in any of its parts, civil or ministerial, except in cases where her just and precautionary rules have been observed: while he denies to her a right to interfere with the conduct of a civil magistrate, in disregarding or acting contrary to these rules. But how can the Church have a power over her ministers to prevent them from solemnizing marriage in such cases, which she has not over her private members, as civil officers? The Church rules violated, are violated by each in the same way; and, according to his own declaration, as they are both acting in the same capacity as civil officers: and why make a dif-

ference? If he allows, that ministers may perform the ceremony at all, as civil officers, is not what is wrong in itself wrong in one man as well as another?—in a civil magistrate as well as a minister?

8th. He says, "the power and duty of the executive is, and in natural justice, ought to be defined and limited by the constitution and laws. Beyond these, he has no right nor authority to act, let the thing to be acted be in itself right or wrong. If these enjoin any thing sinful in its nature, it is duty not to accept of office, or if he have accepted, to resign. But the marrying of a couple whose right is known, is not rendered sinful in its nature by the neglect of publication, were it even of divine appointment." Would it not be sinful in a civil officer to assist and countenance that couple in such a case in violating the divine appointment, as really as if he assisted them in the act of stealing, or in violating the divine appointment in any way whatever. How could a man of a good conscience clear himself in such a case? If previous publication were in all cases by divine appointment, whence has this couple their right to marry or to be married without it, or in the neglect of it? He grants, indeed, more than we ask; but for a strange purpose, truly, as appears to me, namely, to tell us that such is the power which a civil magistrate has to exercise his office in things which are contrary to Church rules, when the civil State requires it, or even allows it, that he may even without sin do in this case himself, and assist others in doing what is contrary to the divine appointment. Truly this is divinity, with a witness! It but furnishes a civil magistrate, if he were so situated that his conduct in doing according to the doctrine here inculcated should be called into question by the courts of Christ's house, with such an answer as our first parents formed before him in a similar case: "The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat." "The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the fruit, and I did eat." I am verily guilty, but the blame is not mine who fell into the sin, but of those who were the means of bringing me into it. Let J. A. call this doctrine what he pleases, I cannot but call it the old doctrine of indulgences revived, with this difference, that instead of money to give a man liberty to transgress without blame, he has but to get into the office of civil magistracy, and then in many things he may do it; and though he is a church member, the Church can get no hold of him.

It is among the refinements of modern times to discover, that when a church member becomes a civil magistrate, he is more bound to respect the rules of the State than the rules of the Church; and that his official character relieves him from all culpability when he tramples upon church rules and flies in the face of the plainest dictates of the word of God. For instance, it is too common for those in civil office to plead, that though the scripture mode of swearing by uplifted hand is the only proper and warrantable mode of taking an oath, and swearing by kissing the book is confessedly sinful, and affirmation is not swearing, but a withholding of what in Scripture is required to the satisfying of parties in matters contested: that because they are civil officers, and the law allows it in either way, they may administer it in either way, if the persons giving testimony before them require it: the sin is not theirs, but of the State and of the party who, having it in his power to choose either way of giving his oath, chooses that which is improper. So it is also in the celebration of marriage. If there is blame, let it be laid on the State or somewhere else. The civil magistrate, in conforming to the regulations of the State, be they right or be they wrong, no blame must be attached to him. This puts one in mind of Naaman's request, "In this thing the Lord pardon thy servant, that when my master goeth into the house of Rimmon to worship there, and he leaneth on my hand, and I

bow myself in the house of Rimmon, the Lord pardon thy servant in this thing." Naaman was a civil officer, as a servant and attendant of the king of Syria; and it was a law of the land, or according to the custom, that he must go there with the king if he would keep his place as the king's servant, which was profitable to him and honorable: and therefore he pleads and expects this indulgence. *Quere?* Was he doing right in asking it, or taking it?

As to the questions, this shall, for the present, suffice; and after a few remarks, I shall close this paper.

If J. A. requires proof that it belongs to the Church to take cognizance of her members in respect to marriage, in their own case, and of those of them who are civil officers in the case of others, as he has a right to demand this, seeing we take the affirmative side of the question here; though it is what he did not give when he took the affirmative in laying down his three fundamental principles which he took for granted, I will give what I believe to be substantial proof of this. It is in these words; (1 Cor. xiv. 40.) "Let all things be done decently and in order." The *all things* there, are all things connected with the profession and duties of the Church and her members, both when they are attending on ordinances, and at other times. It is a summary exhortation in the close of this chapter, to all the duties he had been enjoining upon them in the preceding part of the epistle. Among the directions he gives them, are those given in this chapter, as to the manner in which they were to conduct themselves in the house of God: and, in former chapters, he gives directions in relation to other things, among which, marriage is one, both in the entering into the married state, and the duties which belong to those who are in it. And he concludes with this, "Let all things" (all these and others which might have been mentioned) "be done decently and in order." And whether the mode of celebrating marriage after publication of banns, by which every danger of imposition is most likely to be prevented, and those who enter into the married state go about it openly, and shew that they want not to practice any deception in the business: or by license granted by the clerk of a civil court, or without license, in either of which cases the deed may be done before those, who are deeply interested, may have an opportunity to shew that they are wronged; and if they can get any amends, it is but by a pecuniary allowance, that poorly answers for a marriage contract violated, which was secretly entered into by the parties between themselves, in prospect of a public and legal solemnization of it in due time, are the most decent and orderly ways of solemnizing it, any person of common discernment may judge. The mode of marriage by license and without previous publication, is an approach towards that character which is given in the Scriptures, of the men of the world, namely, that they are the children of darkness, and they love the works of darkness as there is much skulking, secret plotting, and abominable conduct, which attend it. It gives the opportunity, and it is almost as uniformly taken. Children flying off from their parents, and encouraged in this act of disobedience by magistrates, whose office is to preserve the peace and good order of society; and by ministers, those professed teachers of morality; ministers marrying with locked doors; multiplied instances of polygamy; elopements of married sires and dames; violation of promises and solemn pledges given in private, are things which accompany it, of which thousands and ten thousands of instances can be given; few or none of which things are to be found, or at least very seldom accompanying marriage in the regular and scriptural way of its administration, namely, after the publication of banns. And it surely becomes those who have the fear of God in them, and would in all things adorn the doctrine of God their

Saviour, to say, with respect to a mode of marriage which has such evils to attend it, and such a kind of people to practice according to it, "My soul, come not thou into their secret. Unto their assembly mine honor be not thou united." Believers are of the day; and it belongs to them, in a matter of this kind, to shew that they go forward in it with so clear a conscience that they fear no man, and have no cause to be ashamed of what they do. I could shew it by plain and necessary inference from other passages of Scripture; and I could shew it from examples in the cases of Isaac, Jacob, and Boaz, in all of which, what amounted to a previous publication of banns, according to existing circumstances they were in, took place, as they all engaged in it publicly and openly, and made all concerned acquainted with their intentions. In the case of the two first, their intention was made known to the Church, as the families of Abraham and Isaac were then the Church, their servants and attendants were many, and those among whom Isaac and Jacob were conversant. In the last case, it was at the gate of the city, perhaps, because there was no other public assembly than what met there in Boaz's time, who were members of the State, were also then generally members of the Church. But let it be publicly made, and I care not so much whether it be in a religious assembly or not, as one special object of publication is gained, though I am seriously of opinion, that there is no impropriety, but rather a great propriety in doing it in the congregation, publicly, and even on the Sabbath day. I might refer also to the circumstance of the espousals which, among the people of the Jews, went before marriage, and answered the same end as previous publication, the intention being, for a considerable time, made generally and publicly known, and among a people who were generally members of the Church, so as that all danger of improper marriages was prevented, and church members had an opportunity to give the espoused couple an interest in their prayers, in prospect of their entering into the married state in due time. I might refer to the case of Esau, who married without his parents' consent and, in all probability, without their knowledge, and in such a secret manner as marriage by license, or without publication, admits of. And how does the Spirit of God stamp his disapprobation upon it, "which were a grief of mind unto Isaac and to Rebekah." It carried the very evidences of untowardness, rebellion, and disorder with it.

The Editor of the Religious Examiner, a periodical, published in Washington, Ohio, treading in the footsteps of J. A., denies, in a review of *Reasons for the Previous Publication of Marriage*, that there is a divine precept for previous publication of marriage. But out of his own mouth he may be condemned, as he speaks as a member and minister of the Associate Reformed Church, through the Constitution, so called, of that Church, in the Directory appended to it, where the previous publication of marriage in the congregation is allowed to be proper. "It is an excellent means," say they, "of preventing improper or unlawful marriages, that the purpose of marriage, previously to the solemnization thereof, be published three several Sabbaths to the congregation, at the place or places where the parties usually reside." Can any thing be proper in religion, which is not according to the word of God, and founded thereon, and is not taught there by express precept, nor can be gathered from it by plain and necessary inference? If previous publication before marriage is proper, it must come under these "all things" which are to be done decently and in order, and are embraced in this injunction of the Spirit of God, by Paul. And if proper, why so much oppose it? It is probable the Editor will say, that though that church, he exercises his public ministry in connexion with, does speak so concerning it, yet they only view it as a merely civil matter, and they only give their opin-

ion concerning it in this light, not as a thing which properly comes under the cognizance of the Church. It alters not the case, however, for it is as a public ecclesiastical body professing to act under the authority of Christ as the King and Head of the Church, that they so express themselves; in which capacity it belongs to them not to give their own opinions, but to declare what is the will of God in their public ecclesiastical acts, either as more clearly stated in his Word, or as it is taught there by necessary inference: so that, according to his own shewing, as a minister and member of that Church, through this public instrument, there is a divine precept for it. But do they state it as a matter of mere opinion, why oppose and ridicule for doing what he himself, and the body he is connected with, judges to be proper? Let the words of the Associate Reformed Church, in their Directory, be put at the head of his review, in the next edition, as the motto, and see how it and the language of the review will correspond.

2d. It has been a customary rule of the Church to be guided by precedent, in things which were not in themselves considered to be unjust and improper. If the rule of the Church respecting previous publication be a good and wholesome rule, and no evil arises from putting it into practice—if it tends to prevent many evils, as it unquestionably does, for I know female members of the Secession Church, through the neglect of one day's publication, to be married to men who had other wives: and had two days' publication, instead of one, been used, it had been prevented, as the fact of previous marriage was made known before a week elapsed after the ceremony was performed. I have known a prevention of disappointment in this way by but one day's publication. And as being myself a minister of the Gospel, and of course occasionally employed in performing the ceremony, I have to state, that the very last couple I married, which was but a few weeks ago, an important end was accomplished and an evil prevented by previous publication of their intention. I say, if no evil whatever arises from it, and so much good is effected by means of it, why should not the Church be guided by precedent here?

The only pretended evils that arise from it are, 1st. That it is a violation of the Sabbath. If it were a purely civil ordinance, and the Church had no concern with it whatever, I admit that it would be no more proper on the Sabbath than the proclamation of a sale of cattle or of goods of any kind: and let some other way to make the intention public be adopted: and we do not plead very strenuously for its being done upon the Sabbath day, and in the congregation. Yet wherein is the Sabbath violated more then, or even so much, if a violation it is, as by calling week day meetings for purposes connected with the temporal interests of congregations, as is often done, and by various other things of a like nature, which are practised publicly on Sabbaths in congregations? But if it is considered as a thing which religion has a concern in; which is connected closely with the peace and comfort of families; the credit of professors; as a means of preventing many evils which would otherwise occur; and that the parties by this, in a purer and more refined state of religious society, would, by making their intentions thus known in the congregation, have the benefit of the Church's prayers, in prospect of entering into this new relation, as in all things we are by prayer and supplication to make our requests known unto God, and to pray for one another, I see a great propriety in it; and especially on the last account. It is a laudable custom, in some parts of the Christian world, for those who undertake sea voyages to be publicly mentioned in congregations, with a request that they have the prayers of the congregation in their behalf. And a common custom that persons on sick beds and death beds, and persons in a disordered state of mind, be prayed for publicly. And

what makes it improper that the intention of marriage be made public in congregations for this as well as for other reasons? The persons to enter into a married state are about to launch into a relation to one another, which will or ought to end only in the death of one of the parties; and as it is so important a step in the life of every individual who enters into the married state, much of their present and eternal interests being connected with it, and perhaps the interests of generations yet unborn, who are to spring from them; this makes it highly proper, laying aside other considerations, that they seek, and that they have the prayers of the Church in their behalf. Church members, who are to marry, are entitled to the fellowship of the Church in this way, and if this is not much thought of by those who are about to enter into a married state, and neglected by church members, who hear the fact of their intention announced, it is owing to a want of due consideration about these things. This is doubtless an end why it has been the received custom of the Church in times past to require that it be performed in this way: and what, among other things, the Westminster Assembly had an eye to, in the Directory compiled by them, when they say, that "Because such as marry are to marry in the Lord, and have special need of instruction, direction, and exhortation from the word of God at their entering into such a new condition, and of the blessing of God upon them, therein; we judge it expedient, that marriage be solemnized by a lawful minister of the Word, that he may accordingly counsel them and pray for a blessing upon them." And that this be by previous publication that private church members, as well as the minister, should give them a place in their prayers, as well as to prevent evils which might arise from the celebration of it otherwise. If precedent is allowed in the other cases, to warrant the custom that a public intimation be made in the congregation, for the ends mentioned, what may hinder that it may warrant it in this? There is no express command in those cases, more than in this. 2. It is said, that it gives an opportunity to the young and the giddy to smile and behave themselves indecently on the Sabbath day, and in the place of worship. And the editor of the Examiner gives this as what he concludes to be a formidable objection to the practice of previous publication, in his review of *Reasons for the Previous Publication of Marriage*. It gives not the opportunity, I would say; but in a corrupted state of society, this opportunity may be taken from it, as it is taken from the most solemn ordinances of the Church of Christ, by the giddy and profane in their outward attendance upon them. And the circumstance that some may take this opportunity from it, is no reason, if it is warrantable and proper in itself, why it may be laid aside. When Paul preached at Athens, concerning the resurrection of the dead, and some laughed, even to mocking, it was no reason why he should cease to preach the subject of the resurrection as a subject of divine revelation. And if the previous publication of marriage in the congregation be laudable in itself, as may be inferred from the word of God; the importance of the relation to be entered into, &c.; and, as is allowed by all the Protestant churches, and even in the Constitution, so called, of that church, of which this editor professes to be a member, and under the authority of which he exercises his public ministry, though the giddy should smile, and this editor should mock, this is no reason why it should not be done. Indeed it speaks not much for the congregation he exercises his own ministry among, if this is a reason why he does not observe the practice. It is an evidence which goes against the opinion he has adopted, and doubtless practises upon. And it but shews how readily the Lord writes confusion upon their designs, who easily give up with former attainments in religion which the Church has made, and lay aside good and wholesome rules of the Church,

with a view to simplify down religion into as little bounds as possible. The writer has practised it for many years in his congregations, and if the editor of the Examiner were present, he would see no such conduct carried on. For my own part, I can observe mal-conduct in a place of worship, when I am officiating, as readily as others; yet I do not know that I ever witnessed so much as a smile when an intension of this kind was made known; though in other things I observe misconduct sometimes among those who attend upon my public ministrations, as others have to witness it in the congregations where they officiate. It is well known, too, that the audiences in those congregations where the practice of previous publication is kept up, are not behind in general cases, for decency and sobriety in their attendance upon ordinances, when compared with the audiences which attend in those congregations where it is laid aside, if they do not generally exceed in this respect.

3. It is said, that it furnishes with a subject to think about and converse about, which is unsuitable for the Sabbath day. Is it so that by the intimation given publicly on a Sabbath day, that A and B are to enter into the married state, persons have greater temptations laid before them to unsuitable conversation, than they have by hearing that C is to go, or has gone on a long voyage on the deep, and asks the prayers of the Church: or, that D is on a sick bed or a death bed? If, by means of the public intimation made, the conversation or the thoughts are indeed made to turn upon the persons themselves in a carnal and worldly manner, it would be sinful and improper; but it would be no less so in the other cases. In respect to the person going abroad, if the conversation and thoughts were employed on a Sabbath day about what sort of a country he is going to; what is his business there, &c.;—and in respect to the person in sickness, who is the doctor that attends him? has he made his will? and will he leave his family in comfortable worldly circumstances, if he is taken away by death? &c.;—there is no more religion in these things than in talking or thinking about a couple on the eve of being married, in a similar way. And the opportunity given, or rather taken from the one, will as readily be taken from the other, by the un-serious and unthinking class of gospel hearers, who are ready to let any thing and every thing divert their minds away from the things which ought to be thought of and conversed about on the Sabbath day. If the thoughts and conversation turn towards marriage, they may be as suitably employed in respect to it, as in respect to the others. In regard to the man who intends a voyage, or is on his voyage, the dangers of the deep, with God's protecting care of his own by sea and land; the presence of God with his people wherever they are, and things of this nature, may be thought of and conversed about profitably. In regard to the sick man, or person on a death bed, the conversation may profitably turn upon the causes of our sorrows; how to have them sanctified; God's presence with his people in the furnace; and the importance of death, should it be in the cup. So as respects marriage. God builds up his Church, and continues her in this world by it. It being said of Zion, "this man and that man is born there," and through marriage, as a lawful means of raising up a "holy seed to the Church;" the importance of the relation; the duties of it, particularly those which belong to married persons as they are to be helpers of each others' faith and joy; the Lord's blessing on the head of families, &c. And were professors of religion living up more to their duties towards each other; were they concerned to carry the case of persons about to be entered into this very important relation to a throne of grace, and to a view of marriage in its close connexion with the Church, especially in respect of those who are church members, as it is set forth to us by the Spirit of God in the light of his Holy

Word, as in Psalms cxxvii. and cxxviii., and other portions of Scripture, the opposition to previous publication so often and so strongly made, I trust, would soon subside.

3d. J. A., if I understand him rightly, seems to deny the Church to have any authority from God to interfere in matters which relate to men's natural rights; and to assert, that the Church has not a right to use the means of preventing things which are even in themselves cognizable by her courts, after the commission of them: and this opinion of his, I presume, also taken for granted, as to the matter of it, he makes to hold in respect to marriage, which he places among men's natural rights. But in other cases, besides that of marriage, will this apply? Man has a natural right to eat and to drink; but excess in either, and particularly the last, when spirituous liquors are used, in the superabundant use of which the excess is more easily known, the Church has to deal with her members for this: and may she not adopt rules of expediency, whereby she may guard against this evil, as by declaring that church members shall not haunt taverns or other suspected places, by their frequent attendance at which, suspicion rises against them, and the credit of religion suffers, and they are themselves in danger of falling into the habitual practice of drunkenness; and make it censurable to do so?

To "cease to hear the instruction which causeth to err," and to witness such conduct as at camp-meetings and other places is carried on under the name of religion, is a divine injunction, though it is among a man's natural rights that he uses his eyes and his ears at his own discretion. So much for the Church's authority to interfere in matters which relate to men's natural rights.

Again, persons may be where error is preached, and not hear it; and where these things are carried on, and not see them; as they may shut their ears and close their eyes, and use other means, which, as they may conclude, will prevent it from taking their attention. Yet may not church courts adopt it as a standing rule, and a good and wholesome rule, that those in their communion are not to go to camp-meetings and other resorts of the kind, where they would be in danger, and do this in order to prevent the danger? And does not the divine command, in the very words now quoted, require this also as a preventive of error? We are not to suffer sin in our brother; which supposes that we are to use means to keep him from it when he is in danger of falling into the commission of it, as well as to reprove him for it afterward, and endeavor to bring him to repentance. And if the duty belongs to church members individually, it must belong much more to church courts in their official capacity. To prevent sin must be more desirable than to leave it to be committed, and then to deal with the individual for it by reproof or otherwise. The word of God deals much in preventives. In short, what are all the divine commands, warnings, and instructions concerning sin and duty, but preventives? And why, in the case of marriage, must there be an exception? This doctrine of J. A. concerning preventives, would go far to destroy all law and rule whatever, and even deny the State a right to make a law that persons intending to marry shall have previous license, or be previously published.

4th. J. A., though he professedly sets out to shew how Church and State stand toward each other, and declares them to be altogether independent kingdoms, yet he seems not rightly to understand his subject: or, from his great anxiety to establish his point concerning marriage, often contradicts himself, and grants to both Church and State rights over one another; rights which he seems to deny them, and mutual interference in things which belong to the one and the other exclusively; or rather, gives the State a right to interfere with the business of the

Church, while he will not allow the Church any right to exercise her authority over her own members in any case wherein the State is concerned. "The preservation of morality," he says, "yes, and of religion too, in the external form of it, is among the chief ends of all civil government and laws, &c." This is not the view taken of the subject by Seceders. According to them, as far as I know the principles of the Secession, on the subject of the connexion between the Church and State, with the differences which are between them, the ends of civil government are, the civil peace and well-being of the body politic; while morality, as such, is what properly belongs to the Church to look into; and religion, in the external form of it, which refers to the modes of worship, times of it, and circumstances immediately connected with it, are under the particular direction of the Church. These are things civil governments would be stepping out of their place entirely to intermeddle with further than to see that no form of religion should be observed, or any thing under the name of religion taught or professed, that would, in the nature of it, be directly subversive of the ends of civil government. The morality or immorality of any thing does not belong to the State, in the prevention or punishment of crime; so that if a member of State violates any of her laws, let it be even the laws respecting the Sabbath, or any other laws which respect things directly immoral in themselves, it is as they disturb the peace of civil society, and are in some way injurious to their true interests in a civil respect, that she takes cognizance of them. As they are immoral acts, it belongs to the Church to call to account her own members which are guilty, even after the State has performed her part, and deal with them upon an entirely different ground. And in making this the business of the State, he not only allows her to step into the precincts of the Church, and see whether or not her members, who are also members of the Church, perform their civil duties, but he allows her to take the Church's work out of her hands; while he will not allow the Church to enter into the inclosures of the State at all, to see whether her members, who are also members of the Church, conduct themselves agreeably to the rules of order she has formed for the weal of her members generally. If J. A. understood the different interests of the Church and State rightly, he would not deny the Church's right to take order in reference to marriage, and to tell her members in what way they shall enter into the married state themselves, if they will marry: or if their civil officers perform the ceremony, in the case of those who are not church members: and to tell them also that they will be considered as subject to the discipline of the Church, if they do otherwise. There is nothing which the State may take order about, on a civil account, which the Church may not take order about, on a moral account, in respect to those who are her members, whether they be private citizens or officers of State, in so far as morality is in danger: seeing that private church members shall not do any thing contrary to true morality, or which would have a tendency to lead to this: and that civil officers, who are members of the Church, shall not give countenance either to them or to others in such ways. It belongs to true morality, that children obey their parents: that private contracts of marriage between parties be fulfilled, &c.; that "all things be done decently and in order." And marriage by license, and without publication, having a contrary tendency, and giving a ready opportunity to practice all the evils incident to marriage, in these ways it becomes the Church's duty to deal with those of her members, who either marry or are married without previous publication. So far says

ALIQUIS.

ART. II. Church and State, No. 3.

WHEN any practice is cherished and observed by the Church of Christ, as an ordinance of his appointment, one very reasonable enquiry concerning it is, when was this appointment made? And, in regard to those institutions which are genuine, and not spurious, the Bible always furnishes us with a ready answer. Thus the use of sacrifice may be traced to an origin as early as Adam; circumcision, from the days of Abraham; the Passover, and most of the Jewish festivals, from Moses. The divine ordinance and divine *form* of sacred psalmody was *delivered* by the sweet Psalmist of Israel. 1 Chron. xvi. 7. The beginning of baptism, and of the kingdom of heaven, was by the ministry of John. The Lord Jesus himself instituted the supper, the night in which he was betrayed. If it be but the natural and civil institution of marriage, by God, Creator and moral Governor, or both, the date and the express words of the institution can at any time be referred to for the decision of controversies and the solving of difficulties. But what nail has been driven, what score has been drawn, to mark the appointment of the divine ordinance of *the publication of the purpose of marriage*? It is not to be found in the history of the institution of this union, nor in the record of the nuptials of the first human pair. "For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and the twain shall become one flesh." As it is the natural parents, and not the ecclesiastical and civil, who are left in this case, we infer, that it is the former, and not the latter, who have the power to give and not to give in marriage. The Rabbins pretend to enumerate seven precepts of God to Noah; but the rule of publication has never been recounted among them, not even to *round off* the perfect number. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob knew nothing of *the publication of banns*. Rebecca left the house of her kindred and her native country, upon her own consent and that of her parent and guardians; Joseph was married in Egypt; and Moses, in the land of Midian, according to the innocent usages of the respective countries in which they sojourned. Among the great number and variety of moral, ceremonial, and judicial precepts, with which the virtue of chastity was defined and guarded in the law given at Sinai, where is there an express or an implied injunction of the rite of proclamation? "It is not sufficient," says a writer on the subject of magistracy, "to gather up all the passages in the Bible, where there is any mention made of kings and rulers, and then boast a victory in argument over Seceders." So say I, it is not sufficient proof of the divine appointment of publication, that the Scriptures frequently take notice of people's marriages. The frequent mention of marriages without any hint of the rule or practice in question, and in circumstances which are plainly inconsistent with its observance, is, on the contrary, proof that no such rule existed. When "David sent messengers to Abigail to commune with her concerning a match, she arose and went with the messengers, and became his wife." But we are told as an argument in point, that Boaz married Ruth before the elders of the city. If so, they neither were espoused nor had previous publication. The day previous, they both had spent in the harvest field—a purpose of marriage being unknown even to themselves. There is no evidence, however, that Ruth was present in the gate, when Boaz transacted his business with the elders. It could not then be a marriage, being only of one. The transfer of *the shoe* from the foot of one Goel to that of another, was the business transacted, and could, according to the precept, be made in presence of the elders only. The ceremony of spitting in the delinquent Goel's face was not obligatory beyond the option of the woman, and, according to the learned, was seldom, if ever, prac-

tised. But Joseph and Mary were espoused. This is true. Yet *he was minded to put her away privately*. According to the opinion of Spanheim, Heinsius, and others, [on the place] this could have been done, in the most literal and proper sense of the word. The espousals then could not have been public; but only private, before two or three competent witnesses. See Brown's *Antiquities*, Paxton's *Illustrations*, Goodwin's *Aaron and Moses*,—none of which connect publication with espousals.

Again, much weight is laid upon the precept in Deut. xxii. 25, 26. We call upon the defendants of the divine right [of this rule] in order to their building an argument for such a right upon this precept; to establish each of the following positions, all of which we deny—1st. That it is the corruption of a female *by consent*, and not by *violence*, where it is there intended as incurring the penalty of death. 2d. That the penalty of adultery is not due the adulterer, unless he have other means than the woman's own testimony of knowing her to be another man's wife. 3d. That espousals were in all ordinary cases *required* to precede marriage. 4th. That espousals were only tantamount to the purpose of marriage with us, and were not a solemn contract, to be dissolved only by death, or the formality of a divorce. Mary is called the *wife* of Joseph prior to marriage, and his *espoused* wife after it [being still a virgin.] Matt. i. 20; Luke ii. 5. According to the notion of *jure divino* publication, the "banns" should have been proclaimed before espousals, [not after them, when too late,] lest there might be any "secret lets or hindrances." That it is rape, and not simple adultery, which is intended in the above cited text, we have the testimony of Maimonides, the Septuagint—the Vulgate approving—Malvanda, and Menochius, in Pool's *Synopsis*, Ainsworth's, the marginal Bible, and Henry, the commentator. The culprit who, in the following verses, receives a more lenient sentence, is also a raptor, and his life is spared, not so much in mercy to him, as in favor to the woman, whose injury he may alleviate by marrying her. But this, in the former case, justice to the injured husband prohibited. The learned Bingham, who was indefatigable in his labors to establish every rite of the English Church from *ANTIQUITIES*, has produced two authorities which, on this point, he deems relevant. The one is from the epistle of Ignatius to Polycarp: "That it becomes those who marry, and those who are given in marriage, to take upon them this yoke (μετα γνωσης του επισκοπου,) with the advice and consent of the bishop." The other is from Tertullian, in his book *De Monagamia*, upon the duty of being but once married. The passage is also cited in Latin, by the venerable author of *Alexander and Rufus*, and deserves to be translated. "What kind of person art thou [the candidate for a second marriage] who askest permission of that marriage from those to whom it is unlawful to have it themselves? From the bishop who has but one marriage? From the presbyters and deacons, who are under the same [*sacramentum*] solemn oath? From the *widowed*, whose seat thou hast to thine own condemnation renounced. The *widowed* were a religious order, and also a class of officers of that period." The substance of this book is comprised in one syllogism of the author's, found in Chemnitius' *Examen of the Council of Trent*. It is built upon 1 Tim. iii. 2. "Let the priests be the husbands of one wife, that is, be but once married. But all Christians are priests. Therefore second nuptials are prohibited to all." For the Neacesarean council, says Chemnitius, subjects even second nuptials to public penance of long duration—which duration the Laodicean council afterwards decreed to shorten. This Laodicean council has been referred to, in order to exculpate the rule of publication from the charge of Antichristian origin. The reference has been *judicially* sanctioned by Presbytery, and unwarily admitted by the present writer, as correct in

point of fact. I must now retract the admission, finding but one possible ground for the reference. The author of *Notices of Particular Offences*, &c. quotes correctly the council of Laodicea, in opposition to "promiscuous dancing," and goes on to defend publication *upon other grounds*, in his subsequent pages. A certain writer, of cherished memory, refers to Bingham for proof that "the primitive Christians held the neglecters of publication censurable as guilty of adultery." That marriages formed contrary to the wholesome rules, both of the Church and of the State, were held *valid* by the Christians of primitive times, is amply and designedly proved by Bingham. Upon what authority is the antiquarian thus to fasten, as the probable one which Mr. Marshall had in his eye, I am at a loss to conjecture, unless it be one which is only cited to show that the *fact* of marriage was required to be made public in the time of it, and afterwards? It is also from Tertullian, as follows: "So with us, *secret conjunctions* also, that is, such as have not been previously *confessed* to the Church, are in danger of being judged as adultery and fornication! Nor let those who are in this manner connected elude censure under a *pretence* of matrimony."* Seceders have sworn their belief in all the doctrine of the Testimony—not in the opinions of our most respected authors. Ignatius expresses his opinion of what is *becoming* in a language which demonstrates that no proclaiming of purposes was known in his time. Deference in this matter to the judgment of the diocesan bishop was urged as *becoming*. Tertullian found in his day the mystery of iniquity—"which *forbids to marry and commands to abstain from meats*"—arrived at that degree which prohibited *second marriages* without leave asked and obtained—not of the public, but of all the religious orders. He wrote a book in favor of making the prohibition absolute. *Secret conjunctions* and the improper connection, or cohabitation of persons pretending *afterwards* to have been married, not having confessed the marriage *previously* to their being charged and called to answer for the sin, are justly accounted adultery and fornication in all ages. Nuptials celebrated with proclamation, are now deemed by some the opposite of clandestine. They are perhaps so termed in the language of some canons enacted since the beginning of the dark ages. Yet I have never seen any such use of the term "clandestine" in *any* ecclesiastic canon. The marriage of priests was canonized by the name *concubinage*.

A learned and ingenious friend of mine, who considers himself an advocate of publication, in a private correspondence expresses himself thus: "The first act respecting marriage, which I have found, though there no doubt must have been earlier, is by Pope Nicholas, A. D. 858. He ordered that after the betrothing of the persons to be married, the priest ought to cause the persons to come into the church *with their offerings*, and there give them his benediction." After producing a number of acts of a later date and similar authority, against clandestine marriages, which in my view are directed solely against the *celebration* of the thing in private places and companies—out of the church—the same correspondent adds:—"The first express mention of publication which I have found, is in what is known as the Fourth General Lateran Council, held under Pope Innocent III., A. D. 1215." He also cites the council of Trent as speaking thus:—"yet to prevent various evils we ordain, pursuant to the steps of the holy council of the Lateran, which was held under Innocent III., that for the future before any marriage be contracted, there shall be published on three consecutive festival days in the church by the proper parish priest of the contracting parties, during high mass, the

* Ideo penes nos occultæ conjunctiones, id est, non prius apud Ecclesiam confessæ, juxta mœchiam et fornicationem judicari periclitantur. Nec inde consertæ obtentu matrimonii crimen eludant.

names of the parties concerned, &c." Bernardinus de Moor traces the antiquity of publication no higher than the council of Trent. But as this reduplicates upon the authority of the Holy Lateran, I believe that both he and my learned friend are materially correct. And to those who know the character of these two *holy councils* no comment is needed.

"The First Book of Discipline of the church of Scotland, assigns the abuses of marriage, "in this accursed papistry," as the reason for giving judgment, how such confusion may in times coming be avoided. "And for avoiding of dangers, *expedient* it is," say they, "that the banns be publicly proclaimed." Further—"The Sunday before noon we think most expedient for marriage, and that it be used no day else without the consent of the whole ministry." Here the rule is expressly given as an *expedient*, not as a divine ordinance. The contrary of it is therefore, in their judgment lawful. (1 Cor. x. 23.) The stamp of *expediency only* is given this rule by the W. M. Assembly and other Reformers of that period. It is universally inserted—if adopted in any shape—in their Directories and Disciplines—never in their Confessions of Faith. The idea of this rule being either matter or form of it, contained in scripture is quite novel. The demand of the church that magistrates shall enforce it by refusing to marry persons till they comply, although no such requisition be made by the laws of the land, is still more novel; but one session in subordination to the Associate Synod—if that one did—made such a demand until the New Book of Discipline was enacted, or the enacting of it was in agitation. The thing which is harmless and indifferent in its own nature, is to be treated as an *abomination*, when it lays claim to divine honours. It becomes a Nehushtan. (2 Kings xviii. 4.) Paul circumcised Timothy as a matter of expediency. Others wished to have Titus circumcised as an ordinance of God. But "*to them he gave place by submission—no, not so much as an hour.*"

J. A.

ART. III. *Hints to J. A., the author of "Church and State."*

THIS correspondent frowns very heavily on the seven propositions relative to marriage, in the February number, when I said, "Were I to define the contract *as it is entered* into by the parties, I would be obliged to call it sometimes a civil contract, sometimes a political one, and sometimes a religious one, or chiefly so," the meaning, obvious enough, was, that some in marrying, had civil ends chiefly in view; that others had political ends, as is notoriously the case in the marriage of most of princes, and that others have *religious* ends in view, or chiefly so. By stating these things as facts, I did not express an opinion about the marriage contract, as the next words may show. It was not my intention to do so. Neither "have I done so without being aware of it," his assertion notwithstanding. No doubt, had I taken my ground on the *religious contract* which he had in his eye, the prodigious charge fired off in his first pages would have blown me to atoms. But I am not hurt in the least, for I was not on the fatal spot. His skill and pains are lost. Why did he not take hold of the phrase *political contract*, as well as the religious, and prove thence that I was contending for that also? I said, that "Adam could not enter the covenant as the federal head of the human family, without the institution of marriage." His chief difficulty with this seemed to be, that "God had other means than marriage and natural generation lying within the immensity of his eternal wisdom and power. Else, whence came Eve?" (p. 17.) Who doubts this? God

could have made Adam with as many ribs in his body as there were to be human beings. But what is that to the point? God was pleased to "create man *male and female*." Gen. i. 27. This *manner* of creation is identified with the institution of marriage, with which this writer seems to confound the first marriage *contract*. The covenant was designed for man thus circumstanced, and he for it, in the purpose and providence of God. Could he enter it in other circumstances than these? or before he was created? He replies, (*ibid.*) "And so far is it from being true, that Adam could not enter the covenant as a federal head, without the institution of marriage, that the Scriptures plainly teach he did enter into covenant in that character, *without* that institution, and without any assurance that marriage *ever* would be instituted. Gen. xxviii. 17, compare 18—24." Let us read that passage, verse 17; "He was afraid and said, how dreadful is this place! It is none other than the house of God, and it is the gate of heaven. Ver. 18. And Jacob rose up early in the morning, and took the stone he had put for his pillow, and sat it up for a pillar, and poured oil on the top of it," &c. &c. There is but 22 verses in the chapter. It is possible, though not certain, that the author was thinking of the same verses in the 2d chapter of Genesis. If this was his meaning, the proof of his assertion must be in this, that the account of Adam's entering into covenant is given *before* the account of Eve's formation and of the first marriage. If this were good reasoning, then we must admit also, that Adam was formed *AFTER* the first Sabbath, and that the beasts were formed *after* him. For the same reason, we would be compelled to admit also, that repentance is before faith, for it is frequently first mentioned in Scripture. But, truly, this is slender footing; for we are informed of Eve's creation in the 1st chapter and 27th verse, as above quoted. The second chapter does not relate events in the order of time, and therefore makes nothing for his purpose.

Prop. II. God has not left it (the institution of marriage) subject to human legislation, in *any thing appertaining to the right and orderly constituting of the relation between the parties*. In this shape it does not answer him altogether. He first gives his own version of it, thus; "God has not left it subject to human legislation," and then directs his great ordinance against it, and makes it a very horrible thing. But here again I have only to say, that was not my proposition nor my meaning. The proposition, as I gave it, is not touched; it is even *affirmed* by him, in equivalent words, as I shall afterwards show. I quoted several passages from the Old Testament, to show that *God has* legislated on this subject, and straightway he finds me guilty of bringing the judicial law of Moses into the New Testament Church in full force. According to this sapient logic, if I had stated that God had not left the constitution, order, or worship of the *Church* subject to human legislation, and had quoted in proof the charge given to Moses, "See that thou make all things according to the pattern showed to thee in the mount," I would have been guilty of bringing in the ceremonial law also. Does this writer admit the Old Testament to be a part of the infallible rule, and of standing authority in the Christian Church? The passages quoted certainly set forth the Divine will on the subject, and substantiate the truth of my assertion, and prove besides, what he has denied, that God *did* legislate for the *times and circumstances* then being.

Prop. III. God has committed the administration and execution of his laws on this subject to Church and State, in all ordinary cases—completed by him thus: "It is a truth, that God has committed to Church and State, and *heads of families*, authority to administer and execute his laws on *all subjects and in all cases*." (p. 33.) No doubt this addition is a discovery of his own; and, as the reader will find, it is vitally im-

portant to his theory. Heads of families, then, have a co-ordinate and paramount authority on all subjects and in all cases. This is the obvious meaning of his language. And it is confirmed by the following passages: "But the author contradicts himself, the Bible, and the law of nature, in saying that the authority of natural parents is included in that of the civil and ecclesiastic. If it be included in it, it may be controlled by it;" "wherefore, to give or not to give, &c., is the natural and unalienable right of him who is the parent by nature or adoption—a right with which *no power between heaven and earth* may interfere." (p. 39.) Then they may excommunicate, banish, imprison, or put to death. They may give a sister to a brother to wife, and do all and such like things within the parental dominion, and *no power between heaven and earth* may interfere! Imperium in imperio! For aught I know, this doctrine may please a southern nullifier, as being the quintessence of his theory; but it is too repugnant to the common sense of mankind and the voice of Scripture to need any refutation, were it not that the author has left us room to hope that he may be reclaimed from it. For if it can be proved that parental authority is *controlled* by that of the "civil or ecclesiastic," he is bound in honor to give it up, and with all his dislike to the 3d and 5th propositions. Will any man in his senses refuse, that natural parents as such are but members or constituent parts of the two bodies just named? And then, is not the whole greater than any of its parts, and controls them? or, may the *foot* or the *hand* say to the *head*, neither you nor any power *between heaven and earth* have any right to interfere with my authority. My authority is not included in yours, and shall not be controlled by it; I will sooner resist unto blood! Sober reason blushes at the ignorance and audacity of this member's speech. When God gave forth his law on all subjects and for all cases, he delivered not a word of it immediately to heads of families, but to Moses, who, as an officer, belonged to Church and State; and he taught heads of families what their authority was, and what their duty. In the same capacity he commanded them to exercise the one and perform the other. "Teach them diligently to thy children," &c. Deut. vi. 7. And is it not a fair inference, that he who has authority to *command*, has also authority to call to an account? May be, this writer will charge this argument, too, with the consequence of bringing in the Mosaic law into gospel times; but it will not help him; for the apostle Paul, the great apostle of the Gentiles, explicitly commands parents as such. "Fathers provoke not your children to anger, lest they be discouraged." Col. iii. 21. "But bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." Eph. vi. 4. Does not the faithful discharge of ministerial duty, "giving to every one his portion of meat in due season," comprehend instruction to heads of families? When a minister "reproves, rebukes and exhorts, with all long-suffering and doctrine," is the delinquency of parents to be overlooked? No, verily.

Consider farther, that children too, as well as parents, are members of the bodies civil and ecclesiastic, and are directly and immediately under their authority. Both these have authority to *command* children, and say, "Children, obey your parents," and to punish them if they do not. Hence it is manifest, that parents are placed in a dependence on these powers for the enforcing of their just commands and the sustaining of their authority. If a child, during the years of minority, assumes independence of parents, or deserts, the Church calls the culprit to an account (at least has authority so to do) and inflicts on him her spiritual corrections. The State refuses him the power of transacting business, and sends her constable after him, to bring him back to the parental habitation, and to reduce him to due obedience. Parents are, notwithstanding

their natural rights in their offspring, *guardians* of them for Church and State. And, as respects the Church, is not this plain to be seen, when the parent, at the baptism of the child, pledges his authority to her for its instruction in the principles of truth. And when that authority is neglected, abused, or perverted, the parent is accountable. If a parent should be so inflated with the idea of his irresponsible authority as to venture on *giving* his daughter to his son, he would quickly find out that *his* authority was but a small *part included* in that of the higher powers: or if he should exercise despotic cruelty in correction, to the manifest injury of the child, in the judgment of the public, he would find that his right to it was not such but that it might be taken *from* him and placed under a better guardian. It would be but a silly quibble against this, to say, that a parent *has* no authority to do such things, and therefore his authority is not controlled; because, if it be as he says, although parents may indeed go beyond the line of their just authority in many things, as Church and State often do. Yet who between *heaven and earth* has the authority to point out to them this boundary line, and compel them to keep within it? Who does not see that this *controls* their authority? Look again: when natural parents are dead, or deserted, or in any way unable or disqualified to do a parent's part, do not these higher powers feel it incumbent on *them* to step forward and occupy their place? How can this be, unless they have parental authority *including* that of the other? Again: parental authority is controlled when it is limited, in respect of time, to 21 years; and this is by the State. Finally, the duties which we owe to the higher powers are included in the fifth command: of course *they*, as well as the natural parents, must be meant by *father and mother*. But these terms are in the singular. One of these parties must be included in the other—either Church and State in natural parents, or vice versa—the reader will correctly judge which. I have only hinted what might have been illustrated at length. Yet enough has been said, I think, to show that the authority in question is both *included* and *controlled*. Therefore, parents are not the "*ONLY*" party who have a right to give, or not to give. The *including* authority must also be consulted; and, consequently, the parties to a marriage are bound by nothing less than the *fifth precept* of God's law, to acquaint these two bodies with their *purpose*, as a part of honor and duty to them, as well as to the natural parents. And J. A., notwithstanding *all* he has said, concedes this point clearly, as I shall point out.

In the same 33d p. he asserts, that "If the violation of any of God's statutes and judgments, in regard to marriage, were to become general, there could be no Church at all," and asks, "Could the violation, I would ask, of any of the ten commandments become general, and there be a Church?" We know, certainly, there has been *a Church*, without any intermission, since the giving of the first promise, and that there *will* be a Church while sun and moon endure. The question, then, ought to be expressed this way: Has the violation of any of God's statutes respecting marriage, or of any of the ten commandments, ever been general? Did "all flesh corrupt his way?" Was "the earth filled with violence through this?" Was it ever general to have more wives than one? Did Abraham, when the Church was in his family, have more than one? Was idolatry ever general? Was popery ever general? Are there none of the ten commands generally violated at present? J. A. must either answer in the affirmative, or be at variance with his Bible and the common consent of the whole christian world. He may take his choice.

Prop. IV. Is, that since Church and State have authority to administer and execute the law, and, consequently, to judge of a proposed marriage, whether it is legal or not, therefore they have *a right* to know a sufficient

time previous to its celebration to prevent it, if illegal. On which the author remarks, "But this judgment they have a *right* to give on all purposes of marriage, previous to the act, SPECIFICALLY, not *individually*." (p. 34.) Every individual is included in the *species*, as every species is in the *genus*, and consequently, when we judge of the species we judge of all the individuals comprehended in it. To say, then, that we have a right to judge of the *species*, but not of the individuals in it, is a logical absurdity. And he himself avoids it when he comes to the point and speaks correctly. "The question is not, whether marriage formed without the knowledge of either of these powers, Church and State ought to be prohibited." (p. 35.) Here we are agreed. He would answer such a question as I would, in the *affirmative*. This is to say explicitly, that these two powers must be *informed* of the marriage *before* it is celebrated. I have plead for this, that they may judge the *individual* case *before* the act; and he, notwithstanding the above denial of this, agrees so well with it, that he has condescended on the *particulars* that ought to be placed before the authorities in evidence before the act. "These are the only particulars requisite to be known in order to *prevent* illegal marriages—the character of the parties, and the consent of the parents—are they single, and not too nearly joined already by affinity or consanguinity, &c." (p. 36.) This concedes the whole of my proposition. They have a right to *know*, in order to *judge* whether, in the individual case, the parties may lawfully marry. Yet, he denies *all this*, in no measured terms: "For the higher powers to *extort* from men by *INQUISITION*, a confession of their designs, in order to judge of them, implies either an impeachment of their designs as being *bad*, or of their *moral faculties*, as being *incapable of discerning between good and evil*." (p. 34.) This writer is much more at variance with himself, than with my proposition.

I shall not trouble myself nor the reader with any remark on the long lecture that follows the last quotation on *publication*, intermingled with a superabundance of mirth and ridicule, *sui generis*, which he has given "for the satisfaction of all candid persons," in which he "impugns" these same sentiments which he so clearly concedes here.

Prop. V. It is the *duty* of the parties intending marriage, to publish their purpose a sufficient time before, to allow all concerned to bring forward their objections. With this he has not interfered, farther than to say, "It differs but little from the former." But now here, as well as in the preceding, is the *foundation* of publication. One would have expected that, instead of spending his force in demolishing what none were building, he would (so *willing* as he seems to be) have endeavored his utmost to erase *this*. But in the very face of consistency, he *could* not. For, as has been shown, he would *prohibit* marriage "without the knowledge of Church and State." There must, therefore, be an obligation resting somewhere, to *give them* this knowledge, I have ventured above to say, that it rests on the parties, who alone know it. If this does not suit J. A., he will be so good as to state, *who* is bound to inform them—to call in "a competent number of witnesses"—an officer of the Church, and another from the State—all who, "of *divine right*," ought to be at the celebration. While he sneers at publication, he has laid a solid foundation for it; and if he admits the legitimate consequence of his own principle, he *cannot* be opposed to it. And he has indeed given us to understand, that his difficulty is with the *manner* in which the *Associate Church* and some others make it public.

First, he holds it to be not *necessary* in *ordinary* cases. "In such cases," he says, "the persons to be married are known, and their parents' consent, if they be under age, or *non sui juris*, not at their own

just disposal, without publication. This objection has not a foundation sufficient to bear it. He might as well object to the swearing of witnesses in ordinary cases, or to administer an oath of office to good and faithful citizens, every time they are elected; or to making all parents vow to their profession, every time they have a child to baptize. He must know, that it is impossible to administer a discriminating rule with fairness and impartiality; and that, although the law is not made for the righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, yet it is perfectly congenial to the righteous man to keep it, and that instead of being an unnecessary exaction of him, it is that alone by means of which he sustains his righteous character. But I may here put him upon his own rule. What necessity in "*ordinary cases*" for any of his precautions to prevent illegal marriages? Suppose the children of neighbors are to be married, who have never been out of the domestic circle since their birth; what necessity for *them* going to some county officer, who knows nothing about them till he is told, to obtain a certificate that they are *single*, &c., which is perfectly well known before. Why "prohibit such marriages from taking place till Church and State have knowledge of it?" Why a legal number of witnesses? Why an officer of both these bodies present? Would not the marriage in *ordinary* cases be just as free of illegalities, without, as with all these rules? "Does not his insisting on these rules in *all* cases, without exception, look like "a congress *always* declaring war, and parents always correcting their children?"

Second: "The necessity of any thing as a means, implies its *sufficiency*, either by itself, or in connection with other means." (p. 36.) But publication, he holds to be not *sufficient*; ergo, not necessary. Preaching is a means for converting sinners; but there are many hearers never converted; therefore, according to this maxim, it is not *necessary*, and ought to be set aside. Church government and discipline are a means for preserving order and purity in the Church, but these are not sufficient. There have always been impurity and disorders in the Church. Therefore, set them aside. The laws of the land, and officers of justice, and courts altogether, are not *sufficient* to prevent crimes; therefore, they must be set aside. "Congress declaring war," is not always sufficient, in connection with other means, to keep off a foreign foe. Nor "parents correcting" their children, to keep them orderly; therefore, they may cease. It is obvious, therefore, that this maxim is *sophistical*, and, therefore, makes nothing against the necessity of publication. He has stated a different test of the necessity of a means, in the preceding page, and, I think, a more correct one than the *sufficiency* of it, to meet all cases successfully. A means, "when by *law required*, is *necessary*." (p. 35.)

Third: He objects, because "all these particulars" (in which a marriage may be illegal) are, in ordinary cases, with more ease, *accuracy*, and despatch determined by *certificate* than by publication; "and in cases which are not ordinary, and where the requisite information cannot be obtained by certificate, it is less satisfactorily obtained by publication." (37.) That is to say, publication is *less* than no information at all.

He has not told us what steps are necessary to the certificate on which he has his eye. And as there are different steps necessary in different places; if I should specify, he may probably say, that is not what he intended. But if the parties privy to this certificate of his, be only some state or county officer, together with "the one or two individuals from whom he receives all his information in the case, then his assertion is as absurd as it would be to say, two or three persons are better acquainted with the character and actions of parties to a marriage, than a whole town or neighborhood, including the *same two or three*."

He admits of only three things which would authorise Church and State to prohibit a marriage as illegal: "Birth producing consanguinity;

some previous marriage; or, the want of parents' consent." (p. 37.) Must I infer, then, that J. A. would marry the parties together, although one or both were idiots?

"A previous promise of one person to marry another will not, (he says,) authorise either Church or State to *compel* the marriage, or to prohibit the delinquent party from marrying to another than the one promised." Ibid.

It may be so, but that is not precisely the question; but, whether or not has the other party to the first promise the *right* to know of the second promise so soon as it is made? Is it not an injury to them? Does it not release *them* from the first promise so that in equity they *may* contract with another? Has not the other party to the second promise a *right also* to know of the first promise? Would it not be undeceiving them as to the true character of the person to whom they are about to be joined? May it not serve also to acquaint them with circumstances which may have an influence on their whole lives? Perhaps a child may be to bring up, or a heavy fine to be paid, or both. These things must be admitted. But has not the officiating officer a right also to know of the previous promise before proceeding? I am supposing that he ought to have a conscience, the statute book notwithstanding, and that the case may be such as to give just cause for some demur. Suppose this previous promise to be made with the solemnity of an oath, would not a magistrate or minister have a right to hesitate? Now I contend that a certificate, to which perhaps two or three only are knowing, has no *design* to bring this knowledge to them; whereas publication, "as practised by the Associate Church, and some others," expressly contemplates such a case, is well adapted to bring it to light, and has to my knowledge done so.

It is thought a good argument by those on J. A.'s side, to reply that those who are guilty of such things *will not publish*, then what use is publication? But I ask, *why* they will not publish, if their circumstances are *less* likely to be known by it than by certificate? It is because they perceive the reverse of J. A.'s assertion to be true, and that they have a much greater chance to escape detection in any other way than this. They unwittingly testify that publication is a mean well adapted to answer the end, and much better than a certificate.

The author makes merry with the idea, that "the whole fabric of the *divine right* of publication is based on a fallacy." p. 37. Such a fabric must of course fall, and he who beats it down is of course entitled to shout. But if I build it on his own admissions, surely it must stand. I would call the attention of the reader to the following. "Now all the impediment which can render a marriage *illegal* which can *authorise* either Church or State to *prohibit* it must arise," &c. (p. 36.) He admits then, that they *have authority to prohibit* an illegal marriage. He will not deny that they have it from God, nor that it is a trust. In *receiving* it they come under *moral* obligation to exercise it. And they expressly acknowledge this by their oaths and vows of office. In the first place, these bodies are under moral obligation to God for the *full and proper* exercise of this *preventing* authority. Second, Those men who are set apart by these bodies to exercise this authority, upon accepting their office come under precisely the same moral obligation to God. Their receiving it through a medium can neither alter nor impair it. And I think it is impossible for them to be bound to a *defect* any more than to a *transgression*, for both are sin; the peculiar respect which an oath of office may have to a defective constitution notwithstanding. The reader will perceive that I do not say that this moral obligation arises from a *right* to previous knowledge, but from God's putting them in trust. But I say that this authority to "*prevent*," gives them a title to *all* the means of

preventing, of which a previous knowledge of the purpose is a *principal one*. For without it they cannot exercise this authority at all. I also have said that they are bound to exercise this authority so far, in *all cases without exception*, as to demand this previous knowledge of the purpose, in order to see whether it is legal or not. J. A. inadvertently admits this when he says, "The question is not, whether marriage formed without the *knowledge* of either of these powers, Church and State ought to be prohibited. (p. 35.) There is no exception made here to any case—every marriage, in ordinary as well as extraordinary circumstances, he would prohibit taking place until these two bodies *knew* of it. The object of this of course must be to ascertain whether the parties may lawfully marry.

I leave him to adjust at his leisure to this *admission*, the case of a "congress always declaring war and parents always correcting their children." That these powers have a right to *know* is admitted. And I presume he admits that their right to know *before* and *after* the marriage is one and the same; consequently, a "*divine right*,"—"and that it ought of *divine right* immediately upon celebration to be *confessed before Church and State*, &c." (Ibid.) This "*divine right*" must be answered by a *divine obligation*, resting *some where* to make the confession before as well as after. I have said it rests on the parties to be married, because they alone can be supposed to know it. They are bound to it by the fifth commandment. That is a *divine obligation*. I have objected to telling an officer simply, unless he is officially bound to tell it to the public, so that the information may be put in a fair way to reach all who have business. This he also concedes, when he says of the "confession after the celebration before Church and State," that it "is sufficiently done by the *report* of such officer." (Ibid.) From which it follows that it would not be sufficiently done before this officer only, unless he makes a *report* of it to the public body to which he belongs. It would be extremely senseless after this to object to this mode of telling these same two bodies before the celebration; in other words, to object to the purpose being published. "Marriage is in its own nature public"—"of *divine right* it ought to be celebrated before a competent number of witnesses," that is publicly. Let then the civil and religious public be informed by their public officers' report of what is about to take place, and our dispute is at an end. His giving out that I have abandoned the ground by saying that the parties are bound by the fifth commandment to publish their purpose is surely nothing but a wild freak of fancy, attempting to lay hold upon her own shadow. He asserts that I admit it to be a thing indifferent, and then builds on the assertion. My words are, "Although the previous publication of the purpose of marriage were 'matter and form,' a thing indifferent, (which I have shown it is *NOT*.) Some of my readers must have observed that either tacitly or expressly he *admits* the first six propositions. Of the first he says, "this is true, taking the words in their native import and detached from what follows. This truth has been stated expressly in *Church and State*." (p. 15.) I have no objections whatever to express the second in his words, as follows: "Nothing, therefore, which is essential to a marriage, and nothing which is necessary to render the deed of contract, considered in itself and abstracted from times and circumstances, pleasing to God, is left to human legislation." (p. 19.) He asserts all that is contained in the third and more. "It is a truth that God has committed to Church and State and *heads of families*, authority to administer and execute his law on *all subjects and in all cases*." (p. 33. If it be "loaded with errors," as he has said, it is yet all his own. In agreement with the fourth, he says: "The civil and ecclesiastical powers have, it is true, authority to judge of

every purpose of marriage, whether it is legal or not"—"the question is not whether marriage formed without the knowledge of either of these powers, Church and State, ought to be prohibited." p. 34. 35. "Prop. 5," he says, "differs little from the former," (p. 39)—consequently he cannot be opposed to it. He does not make any remark on the sixth,—consequently does not object to it. Prop. 7 was this: "When the Church censures her member, being a magistrate, for the offence aforesaid, (countenancing persons in the breach of the fifth commandment, which obliges them to publish their purpose of marriage,) or upon his refusing to submit, suspends him from sealing ordinances, she does not go beyond her own line of things, or intrude into the peculiar province of the civil authority." Against this he *tries* to say a great many things, which depend altogether upon assumptions not granted. He assumes that he has overthrown the preceding six propositions, which indeed he establishes—that I have abandoned every other plea for publication as untenable but the fifth commandment—that this is the only command for violation of which censure is in this case to be inflicted—that the magistrate in *countenancing* parties in a breach of it is not *directly* guilty but by *implication*—that if the State do not expressly *require* the obedience due to them according to the law of God; or, to use his own very learned phrase, if it do not interpose "a medium," then God's commandment is not violated—that I have undesignedly admitted publication to be a thing indifferent—that it is, just as he has shown, a church rule and may be dispensed with to those who are not our members, &c. &c. Take these things away and there is no bottom to his remarks. He has offered no proof for one of them—and if it devolves on me I am ready to disprove them. There are besides these, other two fallacies, which lie at the foundation of his remarks. The first is, that the church member is lost in the magistrate, and consequently when a man takes that office, the statute book releases him from the duties, which as a christian he owes to the moral law of God, simply because it sets up no statute for them. Will it indeed agree with christian obligation, or even that of a good citizen, to countenance a breach of the fifth commandment simply because some State statute book is defective? This is the question at issue here. Although he has said much, he has said not a word to answer this. I have shown that the parties are bound by the fifth commandment to publish, and that it follows clearly from his own admissions. Their neglect, if it is a breach of that precept, and when a magistrate countenances them in this, he is also guilty of a breach of it. Church and State are as much bound by their high station and official trust, to exercise *authority* to prevent illegal marriages, of which a previous knowledge of the purpose is an indispensable means, as the parties are to honor them with that knowledge. "Of divine right" they ought to know it. Are they at liberty to dispense with this divine right when and how they please?

The second fallacy is this: that if a magistrate would refuse to marry without publication he would be refusing the parties "their natural rights:" whereas the truth is, he would only be refusing to grant natural rights until he had ascertained that they are *their natural rights*. I deny that it is ascertained to be *their* rights until the public have been duly notified of their purpose "by the report of their officer."

"Can the refusal," says he, "of marriage to any whose natural right to it is otherwise good and sure, merely for the neglect of a church rule in a thing indifferent, be argued for and defended from natural principles? If it can, let us have the argument distinctly written. And further, let the duty, the universal moral obligation of being published, be argued for and defended from natural principles, *without begging the question, without arguing in a circle*, independent of ecclesiastical canons, (*nad why not*

also state canons ?) and we will all agree that it is the duty of the magistrate to enforce it." (p. 41.)

Well then, here it is again. "The question is not whether marriage formed without the knowledge of these powers, (Church and State,) ought to be prohibited. For we also assert that in an organized state of society, every marriage ought of *divine right* to be celebrated before a competent number of witnesses," &c. &c. Here J. A. is no *begging the question*; here is a *straight line* of argument, short but very conclusive for publishing. Shortly it is, of divine right a marriage must not take place till it be published. For beyond doubt, when these two bodies know it it is published. Here then is a principle admitted by him perfectly sufficient to sustain all which he demands in order to surrender. I have already shown how "the whole fabric" stands here very securely. It is needless to repeat. It is in substance the same with the 7th proposition.

There are in his papers many strange and unintelligible things, which I cannot detain the reader with. Take this as an instance:—"The marrying a couple whose right is known, is not rendered sinful in its nature by the neglect of publication, were it *even of divine appointment*." (p. 42.)

On the whole, I think the *spirit* manifested through his papers will exert no unfavorable influence on publication. Before parting, I would ask what mean those scornful italics which I have met with in several places, pointing at the *Associate Church*? Do they "grow on Seceder soil, or are they an exotic plant?"

ART. IV. Gutzlaff's Voyages.

MR. JOHN P. HAVEN of New-York has in press, and will publish in the course of a few weeks in a duodecimo volume of 400 pages, Gutzlaff's Journal of his first two voyages along the coast of China. We have here in detail the evidence of those important facts which have been recently announced in general terms, that the great body of the people on the coast of China are strongly in favor of a free intercourse with foreigners, and that the government are deeply conscious of their inability to prevent this intercourse whenever it shall be resolutely demanded. We are indebted to the publisher for permission to give the few extracts from the sheets before us which we have inserted below.

OBJECT OF THE EXPEDITION.—The object of the expedition is thus stated in the introductory paragraph.

The expedition of which I am to give an outline originated in the desire of the factory of the Hon. East India Company in China to facilitate mercantile enterprise, and to acquire information respecting those ports where commerce might be established. We were instructed to use no force, except for self-defence: but by every means so to conciliate the natives, as to establish trade on a basis which would be permanent. We were to visit the coasts of China, Corea, Japan, and the Loo-Choo islands. Mr. Lindsay, our chief and supercargo, a man of the most humane disposition, refined manners, and enthusiastic in such an enterprise, was conversant with the Chinese language. Capt. Rees, the commander, an able seaman and surveyor, was anxious to make accurate charts of the different harbors. We had also a draughtsman among the officers. There was also a learned Chinese on board. I was charged with the office of interpreter and surgeon. Our ship, "The Lord Amherst," was in very good condition, and commanded by able officers.

CHARACTER OF THE CHINESE EMIGRANTS.—The expedition left Macao on the 27th of February, 1832, and was occupied for more than two months in the voyage along the coast of

the province of Canton, and the province of Fuh-keen, which joins that of Canton on the N. E. These provinces it would seem are more populous in proportion to their fertility, than any other parts of China, and the Chinese emigrants found in such numbers throughout the Asiatic isles are chiefly from this region. Mr. G. thus describes the character of these emigrants.

All the districts belonging to Fuh-chow Foo, to which Ting-hae likewise appertains, send forth a great number of colonists, who spare neither danger or toil to gain a scanty livelihood in their foreign homes. A part of their hard earnings is annually remitted to their kindred who are left in their native land; and it is astonishing to see what hardships they will suffer, to procure and send home this pittance. A man of tried honesty is appointed to collect the individual subscriptions of the emigrants, who also engages to go home with them, and there make an equitable distribution to the donees. The subscriptions are regularly noted down, and a certain per centage paid to this commissioner. Before he goes on board, a banquet is given by the subscribers, and then he embarks with all the wishes which human voices can utter, for his prosperous passage. On arriving at his native shores, he is welcomed by all those who are anxiously waiting for this supply. The amount of these remittances is often large, and there are instances where junks have taken on board more than sixty thousand dollars for this purpose. Notwithstanding the great precaution taken to find a proper man for so important a trust, it often happens that he runs away with the money entrusted to him, and the poor families whose sole dependence it was, are reduced to starvation. Good faith is surely not a virtue of which the Chinese can generally boast, though there are honorable individual exceptions; at the same time it must be admitted, that their affection towards their kindred is very strong: neither time nor distance can withdraw their attention from the beloved objects they left behind in their native land. If an emigrant can send but a dollar he will send it; he will himself fast in order to save it; indeed, he will never send home a letter, unless accompanied with some present; he will rather entirely cease writing than send nothing more substantial than paper. There are also swindlers among the colonists, who, on their arrival from China, engage in extensive mercantile speculations, and having acquired credit, and got much property in their hands, either run away or abide the consequences in a jail.

The condition of the emigrants in general, on their arrival in a foreign country, is most miserable; without clothing, or money for one day's subsistence. Sometimes they have not money enough to pay their passage from home, (six or twelve dollars,) and they become bondmen to any body who pays this sum for them, or fall a prey to extortioners, who claim their services for more than a year. The junks which transport them in great numbers, remind one of an African slaver. The deck is filled with them, and there the poor wretches are exposed to the inclemency of the weather and without any shelter, for the cargo fills the junk below. Their food consists of dry rice and an allowance of water; but when the passages are very long, there is often a want of both, and many of them actually starve to death. As soon as they arrive, they fall with a ravenous appetite upon the fruits of India, and many die by dysentery and fever. The climate also has often an enervating effect upon them, but they very soon recover from it and resume their industrious habits. But disappointed hopes render them languid in their pursuits; they came to amass dollars, and can scarcely get cents; they expected to live in plenty, but can earn a bare subsistence. Many therefore become thieves and gamblers to gratify their covetous desires. This is not strange, for it is generally the degraded and vicious of the people who leave their country for foreign parts, and there they rather advance than recede in vice. The propagation of the Gospel among such a class of

men, is therefore attended with numerous difficulties, from the prevailing corruptions.

CITY OF AMOY—INFANTICIDE AND TRAFFIC IN FEMALES.—The city of Amoy is on an island upon the coast of Fuh-keen province, about 400 or 500 miles N. E. of Macao. From Mr. G.'s description it would seem that the inhabitants are the Yankees of China.

After many delays we finally arrived at Amoy. This place is situated on a very large island, on the left side of a bay, which deeply indents the country, and forms numerous islands. The city is very extensive, and contains at least two hundred thousand inhabitants. All its streets are narrow, the temples numerous, and a few large houses owned by wealthy merchants. Its excellent harbor has made it, from time immemorial, one of the greatest emporiums of the empire, and one of the most important markets of Asia. Vessels can sail up close to the houses, load and unload with the greatest facility, have shelter from all winds, and in entering or leaving the port, experience no danger of getting ashore. The whole adjacent country being sterile, forced the inhabitants to seek some means of subsistence. Endowed with an enterprising spirit, and unwearied in the pursuit of gain, they visited all parts of the Chinese empire, gradually became bold sailors, and settled as merchants all along the coast. Thus they colonized Formosa, which, from that period to this, has been their granary; visited and settled in the Indian Archipelago, Cochin-China, and Siam. A population constantly overflowing demanded constant resources for their subsistence, and this they found in colonization. This they have promoted all along the coast of China, up to Mantchou Tartary. As soon as the colonists amass sufficient money they return home, which they leave again when all is spent.

This constant emigration of the male part of the people contributes very much to the destruction of domestic happiness. It is a general custom among them to drown a large proportion of the new-born female children. This unnatural crime is so common among them, that it is perpetrated without any feeling, and even in a laughing mood; and to ask a man of any distinction whether he has daughters, is a mark of great rudeness. Neither the government nor the moral sayings of their sages have put a stop to this nefarious custom. The father has authority over the lives of his children, and disposes of them according to his pleasure. The boys enjoy the greater share of parental affection. Their birth is considered one of the greatest and most fortunate events in a family. They are cherished and indulged to a high degree; and if the father dies, the son assumes a certain authority over his mother. There is also carried on a regular traffic in females. These facts are as revolting to humanity as disgusting to detail.

It is pleasing to observe that there is now a benevolent association in England for the express purpose of instructing Chinese females at Malacca. If this institution can ever exert any influence upon China in this way, for which we sincerely pray, we are persuaded that the degradation and oppression under which the nation now groans will be much alleviated.

* * * * At the beach we were shocked at the spectacle of a pretty new-born babe, which shortly before had been killed. We asked some of the bystanders what this meant. They answered with indifference, "it is only a girl." It is a general custom in this district to drown female infants immediately after their birth. Respectable families seldom take the trouble, as they express themselves, to rear these useless girls. They consider themselves the arbiters of their children's lives, and entitled to take them away when they can foresee that their prolongation would only entail misery. As the numerous emigration of the male population

renders it probable that their daughters, if permitted to live, would not be married, they choose this shorter way to rid themselves of the encumbrance of supporting them.

Thus are the pledges of conjugal love, the most precious gift of the Most High, the most important trust confided to men by the Supreme Being, deliberately murdered. Brutes love their young, and cherish and defend them; but man can divest himself of natural affection, and degrade himself far below the brute creation.

* * * April 7. To-day we got under way. I cannot omit to notice a few more particulars respecting this most celebrated emporium of Fuh-keen, and one of the greatest in Asia. Its harbor is excellent, and accessible to the largest men of war. The natives of this district seem to be born traders and sailors. Their barren country, which furnishes employment for only a few hands, but far more their inclination, prompts them to leave their home, either for Formosa, or the principal emporium of the Chinese empire, or the Indian Archipelago, or for the fisheries along their native shores. Wherever they go, they are rarely found in a state of abject poverty; on the contrary, they are often wealthy, and command the trade of whole islands and provinces, as well by their capital as by their superior enterprize and industry. Strongly attached to their early home, they either return as soon as they have acquired a small property, or they make large remittances. Many of the merchants, settled in the north part of China, return annually with their profits. It is not surprising, therefore, that a large amount of Chinese shipping belongs to Amoy merchants, and that the greater part of capital employed in the coasting trade is their property. Hence this barren tract is one of the richest in China, from the enterprize of the inhabitants. Here is doubtless one of the best harbors for European mercantile enterprize, both for its situation, its wealth, and the stores of all Chinese exports. At an early period the Portuguese traded here; the Dutch followed them; the English, for a long time, had a factory here; and the Spanish have to this day a nominal right to come hither. The cause of the cessation of trade has not been so much the prohibition of the Emperor, as the great extortion to which it was subject. The renewal of commerce will have the most beneficial influence both upon the nation engaging in it, and upon the Chinese.

It is highly desirable that a Christian mission should be established here. The facilities for disseminating the divine word are greater in this place than in any other part of China. The Spanish have a mission in the environs; but it seems to be almost unknown. Though I have had intercourse with thousands of Amoy men, I have never met with one Christian among them.

Boldness, pride, and generosity, are characteristics of the natives. They have always been obstinate against governmental encroachments. They were the last who kept up resistance to the Tartar usurpation; and many of them preferred a voluntary exile in Formosa, or India, to compliance with the customs of their conquerors, and submission to barbarians. They defended themselves bravely at Formosa, and became notorious for piracy. Successful in resisting the attacks of the imperial fleet, they established a maritime government; and were never entirely subdued by force, but finally yielded to persuasion and bribery.

Literary fame is no object of their ambition; but they generally learn to count and to make up bills. Their language differs widely from the mandarin dialect, and they are obliged to learn this with the same labor as we acquire Latin. In their dealings they have a name for honesty above all other Chinese. Though incessantly hunting for gain, they are not mean, and they are anxious to establish a fair character. Solicitous

to cultivate friendship with strangers, they have always associated with them freely, whenever beyond the reach of government. They have been frequently entrusted with high offices, by those foreign states where they have resided as colonists. One of their descendants, as late as the middle of the last century, ascended the throne of Siam. I am acquainted with his son, who became a physician instead of a king, but who, notwithstanding this degradation, possesses royal virtues, and too much sagacity, to be an usurper. He is wise enough to prefer a quiet, humble life, to the pageantry of royalty, with the disaffection of a nation, indignant at seeing a foreigner on the throne.

TIMIDITY OF THE CHINESE.—From Mr. G.'s descriptions, we should think that a single English or American sloop of war would be more than a match for the whole Chinese navy. The following incident which occurred on the passage from Amoy to Fuh-chow, will serve to illustrate the courage of Chinese warriors :

While advancing towards Fuh-chow, the capital of Fuh-keen province, we met several war-junks, despatched, doubtless, in quest of us. We happened to direct our spy-glass towards one of them, which so intimidated the crew, that they ran below decks, and did not re-appear till they were sure of having escaped the danger. We could only ascribe their panic to mistaking the glass for a gun, which they supposed pointed at them.

ARRIVAL AT FUH-CHOW—CHRISTIAN BOOKS ORDERED FOR THE EMPEROR.—On the 22d of April, the Lord Amherst anchored in the harbor of Fuh-chow, the capital of the province of Fuh-keen, about 600 miles N. E. of Macao. A few days after his arrival at this port, Mr. G. received an order for Christian books to be sent to the Emperor. He says :

We were visited by the mandarin of this district, a civil and sagacious old man. He had received orders from the deputy-governor of Fuh-keen province to procure a certain number of our Christian books for the inspection of the emperor. I gave him, accordingly, one copy of "Scripture Lessons," a tract on gambling, "Heaven's Mirror," a full delineation of Christianity, besides a few other books of which he had copies before. I was highly delighted that God, in his wisdom, was sending his glorious Gospel to Peking, that it might be fully examined and known in the palace. Taou Kwang has never shown himself an enemy to popery. In all his edicts against the sects and heresies in his dominions, he does not even mention the name of Christian. Though I know nothing of his character, except that he delights more in pleasure than in business, I humbly hope that the perusal of the word of God will impress his mind favorably towards the Gospel. It is the first time that the Chinese government has taken the trouble to examine the oracles of God. The depravity of the human heart, which is as great in the rulers of China as anywhere, I fear will not permit them to to perceive the glory of God in a crucified Savior. Yet it is the cause of God. The mighty God and Savior will advocate his own cause, and defend it by his omnipotent arm. His mercy embraces China as well as enlightened Europe. The Chinese are his creatures as well as ourselves, and the Gospel is given for their salvation likewise. His wisdom will find ways to convey it to their minds. Though we are unable to fathom his purposes, we wait for the glorious day when the door will be thrown open, and the Gospel ride triumphantly through the land.

HEALING THE SICK—DISTRIBUTION OF CHRISTIAN BOOKS.—Wherever he went, Mr. G. employed himself on every proper occasion in healing the sick, and distributing Christian books. While at Fuh-chow, he says :

I was fully employed in healing the sick, who came in crowds from all quarters. They were afflicted with cutaneous diseases and ophthalmic

complaints. A great many complained of the "heart-ache," others of the asthma, and not a few of coughs. I was highly rejoiced that they came and afforded so good opportunities of proving our friendly intentions. Some among them were suffering intensely, and after being relieved, showed themselves very grateful. Their presents were very numerous, and their letters of thanks very hearty: I had often more than a hundred a day, and might have had triple the number, if I had had time to attend to all the applicants.

I praise God for the grace bestowed upon me, to be a distributor of his holy word. Here was ample opportunity to communicate these holy treasures; for the people were anxious to see and study the books which the emperor was to examine. Often when I came upon deck all hands were stretched out to receive them; a scuffle would ensue, and loud complaints were vented by them whose wishes were not satisfied.

ART. V. A Fact.

THE following is from a brother, whose piety and veracity are a pledge to us of the truth of the following Narrative, and whose labors in the ministry have been accompanied by so many tokens of the power of Divine Grace, as to entitle his opinion relative to a certain kind of revivals, and revival preaching, to some consideration. We are sure, at any rate, that his views, briefly hinted in the conclusion of the article, arise neither from ignorance of the nature of true revivals, nor from opposition to them.—*Cincinnati Standard*.

SOME time since, when I was travelling at no great distance from home, I was overtaken by a man whose appearance was in some measure prepossessing, and whose ready address convinced me, that he was not reluctant to communicate his thoughts. It was only a few seconds after our conversation commenced, that he let me know how highly he had lately been gratified in hearing a controversial sermon on baptism, and requested me to give him my sense of the Greek word *Baptizo*. From this, I understood that he knew me; and on enquiry I found him to be one, of whom I had frequently heard, and whose influence was all thrown into the opposite scale to religion. On ascertaining who he was, I observed to him that there were many words in the original Scriptures more important than *baptizo*, and more interesting both to him and me. Upon this the conversation took rather a different turn, and was substantially as follows.

At first, he was not unwilling to be ranked among atheists. But on being a little pressed, he gave way, and without a blush took his stand on the mound of infidelity. He said, he had not always been an infidel. So far from this, he had for some time held a prominent office in an evangelical church; but was obliged to give up his office, and renounce his religious profession that he might thus be consistent with former engagements, and act agreeably to the decisions of his judgment. He had received his first religious impressions under powerful preaching. The preacher assured him of his entire ability to serve God; and that the measure of his accountability was in exact correspondence with the degree of his ability; and, in his view, confuted those who represent God to be so unjust as to punish man for not doing the things which he is unable to do, without the assistance of a higher power. There was, very soon, a change in the whole train of his feelings, and he concluded that he had "got religion." He joined the church; and from his strong attachment to the doctrines of his favorite preacher, he made the decla-

ration, that if ever he should find a statement in Scripture, plainly indicating that men cannot perform any or all religious duties, without divine assistance, he would then abandon the inconsistent book, and leave the church. He would consider it derogatory to the Deity to ascribe such a book to him. However, after being about six years in the church, and holding office between four and five years, his attention was powerfully arrested by John vi. 44, "No man can come unto me, except the Father who hath sent me, draw him." Now, said he to himself, here is a plain declaration that cannot be got rid of, by any mode of reasoning, coming, too, from the pretended Saviour himself, when adapting himself to the capacities of an unlettered people. "I could as soon believe," said he, "that the book had no existence, as believe that these words were not spoken to teach us that man has not ability to serve God, till he be assisted by divine grace.—This," added he, "destroyed my confidence in religion, and since that time I have been guided by my own mind, and have served God as well as I know how."

He then showed me the views he had of God, and to what extent he reckoned himself under obligations to Him. At length I succeeded in convincing him that he must be condemned by his own rule of judgment. I next endeavored to convince him farther, that his great preacher was likely a conceited metaphysician, and needed himself to be instructed in the elements of the Gospel; and that he, the person with whom I was conversing, had likely never been at a throne of grace yet; that he had all along been rejecting the doctrine of Scripture respecting our fallen state and nature; and that if he had not been under the influence of fancy and prejudice, he never would have had what he esteemed his religious consolations. I then attempted to show him that we really are in the helpless state, which he had been taught to deny, and that the Gospel is entirely adapted to our condition.—Before we parted, he shed tears, and assured me he would on that day commence secret prayer on a principle very different from that on which he had ever previously performed it. I left the neighborhood a few weeks afterwards, and have not had an opportunity of knowing what has been his course of conduct subsequent to this interview.

Now, Sir, was not this man awakened from his slumbers by what is popularly denominated "revival preaching?" Is he not a specimen of a great portion of what are styled, revival Christians? I have reason to believe that he was deficient in neither gifts nor zeal, though void of that humble faith, which comes to a throne of grace empty handed, and embraces the promises in all their number and extent, that the soul may be made willing and obedient, and that "God may be all in all."—Is it not to be dreaded, that if our new doctrine and new measure Christians were only as intelligent, considerate, and decided, as this man, they would follow on in the same tract, till they arrived at the same mournful point in their progress?—And is it true, as reported, that a wise man has come from the East, with the avowed purpose of "indoctrinating the rising ministry in the West," in these specious, but delusive and destructive views in theology?

A COUNTRY PASTOR.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—"Prayer for the Prosperity of Zion," and one or two other articles have been received, which will be inserted soon after the Minutes of Synod. The November number may be looked for in about three weeks after the adjournment of Synod, that is, soon after the first of the month.

complaints. A great many complained of the "heart-ache," others of the asthma, and not a few of coughs. I was highly rejoiced that they came and afforded so good opportunities of proving our friendly intentions. Some among them were suffering intensely, and after being relieved, showed themselves very grateful. Their presents were very numerous, and their letters of thanks very hearty: I had often more than a hundred a day, and might have had triple the number, if I had had time to attend to all the applicants.

I praise God for the grace bestowed upon me, to be a distributor of his holy word. Here was ample opportunity to communicate these holy treasures; for the people were anxious to see and study the books which the emperor was to examine. Often when I came upon deck all hands were stretched out to receive them; a scuffle would ensue, and loud complaints were vented by them whose wishes were not satisfied.

ART. V. A Fact.

THE following is from a brother, whose piety and veracity are a pledge to us of the truth of the following Narrative, and whose labors in the ministry have been accompanied by so many tokens of the power of Divine Grace, as to entitle his opinion relative to a certain kind of revivals, and revival preaching, to some consideration. We are sure, at any rate, that his views, briefly hinted in the conclusion of the article, arise neither from ignorance of the nature of true revivals, nor from opposition to them.—*Cincinnati Standard*.

SOME time since, when I was travelling at no great distance from home, I was overtaken by a man whose appearance was in some measure prepossessing, and whose ready address convinced me, that he was not reluctant to communicate his thoughts. It was only a few seconds after our conversation commenced, that he let me know how highly he had lately been gratified in hearing a controversial sermon on baptism, and requested me to give him my sense of the Greek word *Baptizo*. From this, I understood that he knew me; and on enquiry I found him to be one, of whom I had frequently heard, and whose influence was all thrown into the opposite scale to religion. On ascertaining who he was, I observed to him that there were many words in the original Scriptures more important than *baptizo*, and more interesting both to him and me. Upon this the conversation took rather a different turn, and was substantially as follows.

At first, he was not unwilling to be ranked among atheists. But on being a little pressed, he gave way, and without a blush took his stand on the mound of infidelity. He said, he had not always been an infidel. So far from this, he had for some time held a prominent office in an evangelical church; but was obliged to give up his office, and renounce his religious profession that he might thus be consistent with former engagements, and act agreeably to the decisions of his judgment. He had received his first religious impressions under powerful preaching. The preacher assured him of his entire ability to serve God; and that the measure of his accountability was in exact correspondence with the degree of his ability; and, in his view, confuted those who represent God to be so unjust as to punish man for not doing the things which he is unable to do, without the assistance of a higher power. There was, very soon, a change in the whole train of his feelings, and he concluded that he had "got religion." He joined the church; and from his strong attachment to the doctrines of his favorite preacher, he made the decla-

ration, that if ever he should find a statement in Scripture, plainly indicating that men cannot perform any or all religious duties, without divine assistance, he would then abandon the inconsistent book, and leave the church. He would consider it derogatory to the Deity to ascribe such a book to him. However, after being about six years in the church, and holding office between four and five years, his attention was powerfully arrested by John vi. 44, "No man can come unto me, except the Father who hath sent me, draw him." Now, said he to himself, here is a plain declaration that cannot be got rid of, by any mode of reasoning, coming, too, from the pretended Saviour himself, when adapting himself to the capacities of an unlettered people. "I could as soon believe," said he, "that the book had no existence, as believe that these words were not spoken to teach us that man has not ability to serve God, till he be assisted by divine grace.—This," added he, "destroyed my confidence in religion, and since that time I have been guided by my own mind, and have served God as well as I know how."

He then showed me the views he had of God, and to what extent he reckoned himself under obligations to Him. At length I succeeded in convincing him that he must be condemned by his own rule of judgment. I next endeavored to convince him farther, that his great preacher was likely a conceited metaphysician, and needed himself to be instructed in the elements of the Gospel; and that he, the person with whom I was conversing, had likely never been at a throne of grace yet; that he had all along been rejecting the doctrine of Scripture respecting our fallen state and nature; and that if he had not been under the influence of fancy and prejudice, he never would have had what he esteemed his religious consolations. I then attempted to show him that we really are in the helpless state, which he had been taught to deny, and that the Gospel is entirely adapted to our condition.—Before we parted, he shed tears, and assured me he would on that day commence secret prayer on a principle very different from that on which he had ever previously performed it. I left the neighborhood a few weeks afterwards, and have not had an opportunity of knowing what has been his course of conduct subsequent to this interview.

Now, Sir, was not this man awakened from his slumbers by what is popularly denominated "revival preaching?" Is he not a specimen of a great portion of what are styled, revival Christians? I have reason to believe that he was deficient in neither gifts nor zeal, though void of that humble faith, which comes to a throne of grace empty handed, and embraces the promises in all their number and extent, that the soul may be made willing and obedient, and that "God may be all in all."—Is it not to be dreaded, that if our new doctrine and new measure Christians were only as intelligent, considerate, and decided, as this man, they would follow on in the same tract, till they arrived at the same mournful point in their progress?—And is it true, as reported, that a wise man has come from the East, with the avowed purpose of "indoctrinating the rising ministry in the West," in these specious, but delusive and destructive views in theology?

A COUNTRY PASTOR.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—"Prayer for the Prosperity of Zion," and one or two other articles have been received, which will be inserted soon after the Minutes of Synod. The November number may be looked for in about three weeks after the adjournment of Synod, that is, soon after the first of the month.

ART. VI. Summary Statistical Report of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, for 1833.

THIS portion of the Catholic Church of Christ in the world, under one General Assembly of Bishops and Ruling Elders styled *Commissioners*, which, with the *Delegates* from Corresponding Bodies, in May last, consisted of two hundred and seventy-four persons, comprehends, according to the returns now in my possession, twenty-two *Synods*; one hundred and eleven *Presbyteries*; eighteen hundred and fifty-five ordained *Bishops*; two hundred and fifteen *Licentiates*; making two thousand and seventy *Preachers of the Gospel*; two hundred and twenty-nine *Candidates* in a state of preparation for the ministry; twenty-five hundred *churches*; and two hundred and thirty-three thousand five hundred and eighty *Communicants*. Our INCREASE during the last year has been, in *Bishops*, one hundred and twenty-five; in *Licentiates*, ten; in *Candidates*, nine; in ordained and licensed *Preachers*, one hundred and thirty-five; in *Churches*, one hundred and nineteen; and in *Communicants*, sixteen thousand two hundred and forty-two. The *Communicants* added, on examination, last year, were twenty-three thousand five hundred and forty-six; being ten thousand six hundred and fourteen LESS than were reported in 1832, as added in the same way. Seven thousand two hundred and fifty-two were added last year by certificates from other churches, or passed from one of our congregations to another, being three hundred and sixty-six MORE than were received in the same manner the year previous. The total of additions now reported is thirty thousand seven hundred and ninety-eight. Of these, fourteen thousand five hundred and fifty-six must be considered as equal to the number of persons who have deceased, or been dismissed or suspended, or who were at the time of making the reports in a state of transition from the care of one session to another, or who for some reason have not been reported as members: leaving as above stated the net gain in communicants of 1833 over the whole number of 1832 at sixteen thousand two hundred and forty-two. The baptisms now returned amount to twenty-one thousand eight hundred and twenty; of which six thousand nine hundred and fifty were *adults*, fourteen thousand and thirty-five of *infants*, and eight hundred and thirty-five of persons *not distinguished*. The baptisms of 1832 exceeded those of 1833 by two thousand eight hundred and eighty-three. The funds reported as having been collected in the year preceding the meeting of the last General Assembly were for *missionary purposes*, seventy-six thousand four hundred and twenty dollars and thirty-nine cents; for defraying the expenses of *Commissioners* to the Assembly, four thousand six hundred and eighty-nine dollars and fifty-eight cents; for different *Theological Seminaries* six thousand three hundred and eleven dollars and twenty-three cents; for the *Education* of poor and pious youth, principally with reference to their becoming ministers of the Gospel, forty-seven thousand one hundred and fifty-three dollars and sixty-five cents; and for the *Contingent expenses* of the Assembly, eight hundred and ninety-two dollars and eighty-seven cents; which give a total of one hundred and thirty-five thousand four hundred and sixty-seven dollars and seventy-two cents, collected for charitable uses. This sum is less than the total for the same objects in 1832 by two thousand three hundred and fifty-one dollars and sixty-seven cents. Eleven Presbyteries have made no returns of any collections; and four have reported only on the Commissioners' Fund. In all the Presbyteries there are several churches which have made no reports on any subject, for some time past; and some which have never returned so much as the number of their communicants, since I have been Stated Clerk. Our statistics, however, are much more complete than they formerly were; and must be regarded as a near approximation to an exact statement of the numbers and operations of our whole body.

The following names of deceased Presbyterian ministers of our connexion should have been given last year, viz:

Rev. Duncan M'Intyre, of the Presbytery of Fayetteville, and Rev. John T. Hamilton, of the Presbytery of West Lexington.

Since the last publication on this subject the subscriber has ascertained the death of the following twenty-six brethren; viz.

Rev. Ebenezer Fitch, D. D. and Jeremiah Stow, of the Presbytery of Ontario; Talcot Bates, Onondaga; Joseph Bracket, Geneva; William Lyman, D. D. Genesee; Simon Hosack, D. D. Albany; Griffith H. Griffith, Bedford; Nathaniel Reeve, Long Island; Herman Daggett, North River; Robert Bryson, Northumberland; John Glendy, D. D. and Samuel Knox, Baltimore; Joseph W. Barr, Philadelphia; Robert H. Chapman, D. D.* Western District; James H. Brookes and William Hume, West Tennessee; Robert Marshall, West Lexington; Robert L. Caldwell and Thomas Espy, Concord; William M'Millan, D. D. Steubenville; John R. Moreland, Indianapolis; Samuel Stanford, Fayetteville; Murdock Murphy, South Alabama; Alexander Kirkpatrick, South Carolina; John M'Ewen, Harmony; Joseph Stockton, Ohio.

With lamentation that it should be necessary, we state the fact of the suspension of three of our ministers during the last year; two of them for intemperance in drink; and one for heresy in doctrine.

The foregoing is a true summary, (E. E.) prepared by me this 31st day of July, 1833.

EZRA STILES ELY,
Stated Clerk of the General Assembly.

* Dr. Chapman attended the Assembly of May, 1833, in excellent health, and died at Winchester, Va. on his journey home, after a very short illness.